

Some mistake having occurred in relation to the extent of the amount proposed yesterday by Mr. Jacobs, to the fifth section of the report of the committee on the judiciary,

Some comment followed on the part of Messrs. Dirickson, Jacobs, Spencer, Sellman and other gentlemen, when

Mr. JACOBS moved to re-consider the vote of the Convention on the amendment offered by him on yesterday to the 5th section of the report of the committee on the judiciary, and to be found on page 629 of the Journal.

Determined in the affirmative.

Mr. JACOBS then moved to amend said 5th section by striking out in the 3d and 4th lines, these words, "from among those learned in the law, having been admitted to practice the law in this State, at least five years, and above the age of thirty years at the time of his election, and a resident of the judicial district."

Mr. McMASTER moved the question be taken by yeas and nays, and being ordered, appeared as follows:

Affirmative—None.

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Wells, Kent, Randall, Sellman, Weems, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Ridgely, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, McCullough, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, Spencer, Grason, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Johnson, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Schley, Fiery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Ege, Shower and Brown—75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHRIVER presented two petitions of sundry citizens of the State in relation to the license system, which was read, and severally referred to the select committee appointed on that subject.

On motion of Mr. BISER the Convention took up for consideration, the motion made by him on the 18th inst., to reconsider the vote of the Convention upon the proviso submitted by Mr. Brent, of Balt. city, to the 43d section of the report of the committee on the Legislative Department.

Mr. DONALDSON called the attention of the Convention to the fact that the general debate on the judiciary system was to terminate this day at twelve o'clock, after which time, explanations of ten minutes duration only would be in order. There were but two hours left for debate. Probably it was scarcely proper that another proposition should be introduced just at this time. The Convention, he thought, should make the most of the time that remained. There were some further important amendments which gentlemen desired to explain.

Mr. BISER desired, he said, to throw no ob-

stacles in the way of the consideration and discussion of the judiciary question. He would not, therefore, press the motion to re-consider at this time; but would move that its further consideration be postponed until Tuesday next. Ordered accordingly.

THE JUDICIARY SYSTEM.

The Convention then resumed the consideration of the order of the day, being the report heretofore submitted by Mr. Bowie, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The pending question was on the amendment offered by Mr. Crisfield to the 9th section of the report.

Mr. SPENCER. My object to-day is, in as brief a manner as I can, to compare the expenses of the judiciary system in Maryland with those of Pennsylvania, having already compared them with New York, two of the Northern States, and of Kentucky and Ohio, two of the Western States, in order to show what has been the character of the judiciary in those respective States, and what duties they had to perform. My object is further to show that what is recommended by the substitute I have had the honor to propose, and what has been recommended by the substitute of the gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Crisfield) requires from the judges of the State the performance of no greater amount of labor than is performed by the judges in other States. I will then ask if this Convention is willing to say that Maryland is entirely behind the age, and incapable, for want of legal knowledge and talent, of performing the same labor and service, with the same effect and the same results as in those other States.

First, let me refer to the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has thirty-six judges, at a cost of \$75,311 67, including an estimate of \$2,745 for traveling expenses, allowed by law to judges of the Supreme Court. And here let me remark that I am told that this estimate for traveling expenses is by far too large. In that State the judges perform all the duties which are performed in this State by Orphans' Court judges, common law judges and chancellors; and yet they have but thirty-six judges, whilst the bill under consideration proposes thirty for this State, at the expense of \$62,500. (See American Almanac, pages 240—241.)

In Pennsylvania, by the census of 1840, (page 26) the population was 1,724,033. Her capital, in manufactures and the foreign and retail trade, was \$70,719,686. (See pp. 153, 145, census of 1840.)

Her agricultural produce in wheat, barley, oats, rye, buckwheat and Indian corn, was 55,132,246 bushels. (See p. 258 census of 1840.)

And now let me ask if, with a population on our part at the same time of only 470,019, and with wealth in the same items of trade of \$20,110,454, and with an agricultural produce in the same articles, of 15,913,857 bushels, it can be expected that whilst Pennsylvania has only thirty-six judges, at a cost of \$75,311 67, Maryland is to have fixed upon her thirty judges, at a cost of \$62,500? (See census of 1840, pp. 153, 358, 360.)